

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. CR 87-0953-01 MHP

Plaintiff(s),

**ORDER REVOKING SUPERVISED  
RELEASE AND JUDGEMENT**

v.

MAURICE MIGUEL TATUM,

Defendant(s).

This matter came on pursuant to an Order to Show Cause why supervised release should not be revoked. Defendant appeared in person with his attorney Gilbert Eisenberg. The United States was represented by Assistant United States Attorney Anna Pletcher.

The defendant was advised of the following:

1. His right to a hearing on the alleged violations of supervised release;
2. His right to confront and cross-examine witnesses;
3. His right to produce evidence and witnesses at the hearing without cost to him if he could not afford the same;
4. His right to continue to have court appointed counsel represent him throughout the proceedings; and
5. The nature of the revocation proceedings and the consequences if a violation was found and supervised release revoked or modified.

The court finds that defendant was fully advised of his constitutional and statutory rights in connection with these proceedings either as a basis for modification or revocation; that he fully understands the nature of the proceeding and the defenses that he may assert in the proceeding; that he fully understands the consequences of the proceeding; and that he freely and voluntarily waives

1 his right to a hearing, his counsel consenting thereto.

2 The court finds that the defendant has admitted to the violations as alleged in the petition to  
3 revoke and that such violations are sufficient cause to revoke supervised release.

4  
5 Charge 1: Violation of Standard Condition which states that defendant shall not commit  
6 any federal, state, or local crime in that on January 6, 2010, defendant was  
7 arrested by SFPD for Dissuading a Witness.

8 Charge 2: Violation of Standard Condition which states that defendant shall consent to  
9 be monitored by location monitoring and shall abide by all of the  
10 requirements established by the probation officer related to the use of this  
11 location monitoring technology in that on January 4, 2010, defendant's home  
12 telephone line had failed prior to his departure from his residence.

13 Charge 3: Violation of Standard Condition which states that defendant shall consent to  
14 be monitored by location monitoring and shall abide by all of the  
15 requirements established by the probation officer related to the use of this  
16 location monitoring technology in that defendant failed to submit appropriate  
17 request for a schedule change.

18 Based on the foregoing,

19 IT IS ADJUDGED that Supervised Release is hereby REVOKED and defendant is  
20 remanded to custody of Bureau of Prisons for a term of nine (9) months. No further term of  
21 supervised release is ordered.

22  
23  
24 Dated: 5/6/2010

  
MARILYN HALL PATEL  
United States District Court